

# Supreme Court Broadcast a Hit

In an unprecedented outreach effort, the California Supreme Court, in coordination with the Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District, held a special session of its oral argument calendar in Fresno. The session was broadcast live on television, allowing thousands of individuals an opportunity to see the court in action.

## BROADCAST FOR STUDENTS

To help bring the session to local students in nearly 200 high schools, the Supreme Court arranged to have its proceedings on the morning of October 8 broadcast live on Valley Public Television and the California Channel. The California Channel is carried on 125 cable stations throughout the Central Valley.

Students who watched the proceedings had previously been furnished with materials that explained the court processes and gave background information on the cases being argued. Days before the Supreme Court's October 8–9 session, justices from the Fifth Appellate District participated in a panel discussion with high-school students about the judicial process. That discussion was videotaped and made available to Central Valley high schools to prepare them for the special Supreme Court session. In addition, Kern County educators

worked with the appellate court to prepare a study guide, available on the Internet, that provided the history of the Supreme Court and some of the legal issues it would confront during its arguments.

The special Supreme Court session opened with welcoming remarks by Chief Justice Ronald M. George and Fifth Appellate District Presiding Justice James A. Ardaiz. Before the first case was heard, the justices held a question-and-answer session with the 120 students who were able to attend the session in person. Students' questions ranged from how the court decides which cases to review to how a person can become a Supreme Court justice.

During oral argument, Justice Ardaiz provided commentary for Valley Public Television's broadcast. In Bakersfield, four local appellate court justices—Dennis A. Cornell, Nickolas J. Dibiaso, Gene M. Gomes, and Rebecca A. Wiseman—watched the broadcast with more than 150 high-school students in a conference room at the school district headquarters. They also answered questions about cases, procedures, and their jobs as jurists. Additional Central Valley lawyers and judges visited other high-school classrooms to watch the broadcast and answer the students' questions.

## CASES HEARD

In addition to the introductions and the question-and-answer discussion, viewers of the broadcast heard three cases being argued before the Supreme Court: *In re Rosenkrantz*, S104701, which involves the Governor's authority to review parole decisions; *People v. Stanistreet*, S102722, which involves the constitutionality of a law that makes it a misdemeanor to file a knowingly false allegation of misconduct against a peace officer; and *In re Roberts*, S071835, which involves various issues

raised in a habeas corpus petition in a death penalty case. In total, the court held oral arguments in 10 cases during the two-day visit.

The Supreme Court's special session was its first in Fresno. In recent years, it has met in Riverside, San Diego, and Santa Ana and in the B. F. Hastings Building in Old Sacramento. The court regularly holds oral argument sessions in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Sacramento on a rotating basis. ■



A local high-school student addresses the members of the California Supreme Court during its special October 8-9 session in Fresno. Part of the court's session was broadcast live on television, allowing thousands of individuals an opportunity to see the court in action. Photo: Paul Sakuma, Associated Press

## A Time to Build

*Continued from page 1*

buildings are in need of repair, renovation, and maintenance.

## FUNDING

The new legislation recognizes the need for and addresses the issue of state funding for facility needs, providing for new revenue streams to assist in the support of the transition.

First, the act calls for each county to pay to the state an amount equal to what the county historically expended for the operation and maintenance of court facilities. These funds will be deposited into the Court Facilities Trust Fund. Money deposited into this fund is to be appropriated by the Legislature and administered by the Judicial Council for the operation, leasing, repair, and maintenance of court facilities.

Second, the legislation creates the State Court Facilities Construction Fund. The fund will be supported by additional penalties for certain criminal acts; penalties resulting from traffic offenses; and surcharges on civil, family law, and probate actions. Money deposited into this fund is to be appropriated by the Legislature and administered by the Judicial Council to help fund acquisition, rehabilitation, or construction of court facilities.

## NEXT STEPS

Currently, the Judicial Council and the AOC are overseeing facilities master planning on a county-by-county basis and will soon begin seismic evaluations.

Working from the general findings of the task force, the AOC and the trial courts are developing specific facilities plans that consider such issues as projections of population, case loads, judgeships, and staffing; current status of existing facilities; land availability; shared-use opportunities; security; and fire and safety issues. Following the completion of the master plans in August 2003, the council and the AOC will develop a five-year capital improvements plan that will set construction priorities for the judicial branch. They will establish criteria for prioritizing projects, based in part on the master plans.

The legislation becomes effective January 1, 2003, and negotiations for the transfer of court facilities from the counties to the state are set to begin as early as July 1, 2003. The bill allows for actual transfers to commence in July 2004 and for all transfers to be completed by the summer of 2007.

In the next six months, the AOC and CSAC will lead a working group that will schedule negotiations and establish the detailed process for transferring court facilities from the counties to the state, including the creation of transfer forms and forms for calculating related county payments. During this period, the Judicial Council, with input from courts and other stakeholders, will consider and establish formal transfer policies and procedures. The AOC's Finance Division will keep the courts updated on these activities and explain their role in preparing for the transfers.

● To view the full text of Senate Bill 1732, visit [www.leginfo.ca.gov/bilinfo.html](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/bilinfo.html). The Task Force on Court Facilities report is available at [www2.courtinfo.ca.gov/facilities/reports.htm](http://www2.courtinfo.ca.gov/facilities/reports.htm). For more information, contact the Office of Capital Planning, Design, and Construction in the AOC's Finance Division, 415-865-7986; or e-mail Kim Davis, assistant director, [kim.davis@jud.ca.gov](mailto:kim.davis@jud.ca.gov). ■

## Highlights of SB 1732

The Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 (Sen. Bill 1732) establishes procedures for the transition of responsibility for court facilities from the counties to the state and establishes new revenue streams to assist in that process. Following are some of its provisions.

- ◆ Assigns the Judicial Council and the Administrative Office of the Courts as an owner for state court facilities, with responsibility, jurisdiction, and control over planning, construction, acquisition, disposition, operation, and maintenance;
- ◆ Allows historical buildings to remain under county ownership;
- ◆ Establishes the Court Facilities Trust Fund and the State Court Facilities Construction Fund;
- ◆ Creates a new statewide filing fee surcharge for court construction;
- ◆ Establishes the Court Facilities Dispute Resolution Committee to hear disputes between a county and the Judicial Council regarding specified matters involving the transfer of facilities; and
- ◆ Establishes the Transitional State Court Facilities Construction Fund to receive and disburse monies for certain court facilities transferred to the Judicial Council that are subject to bonded indebtedness.

# Project Aims to Improve Child Advocacy

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is working with child advocacy agencies in Santa Clara and Santa Cruz Counties on a project to establish and evaluate collaboration between dependency attorneys and Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) volunteers.

The purpose of the CASA-Attorney Collaboration Demonstration Project is to study the way that attorneys and CASAs interact and to improve their collaboration in order to meet the needs of children in abuse and neglect cases. The project will collect and track information on the evolution of the partnership and changing roles of these groups, recognizing the independent and unique advocacy role of each in representing the interests of children.

## NEED FOR PROJECT

Since 1974, under the federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, every child subject to an abuse or neglect proceeding must have a guardian ad litem (guardian appointed pending the outcome of the proceeding) who is either an attorney or a volunteer. Currently in Cali-

fornia, an attorney represents nearly every child in the dependency system, and approximately 5 percent of these children also have a CASA assigned to them.

Last year, the Legislature passed Senate Bill 2160, which directed the Judicial Council to adopt a rule of court and guidelines to assist the local courts in determining whether the attorney or the CASA should be appointed guardian ad litem in each case. The implementation of this legislation has resulted in the need to develop a clear definition of the roles and responsibilities of attorneys and CASAs in the dependency context.

## HOW IT WORKS

Each county involved in the project has an advisory committee that will provide leadership and guidance. Each committee consists of judges and commissioners; representatives from the county's CASA program, legal service provider, and department of social services; the county's ombudsperson (if established); and representatives from the California Youth Connection.

Starting in June 2002, staff of the Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) and consultants facilitated start-up meetings of the advisory committees. The meetings allowed CFCC staff to introduce their research analysts and review requirements and measurement tools to be used during the project.

## MEASUREMENT TOOLS

Researchers will gather information from the multiple parties involved in the dependency system, utilizing tools such as surveys, interviews, and focus groups to chronicle events taking place in the CASA program and dependency system in each county. The CFCC research analysts will periodically consult with the local CASA executive director on whether any major changes (such as the assignment of a new juvenile court presiding judge) occurred in the court system.

CASAs and attorneys will meet monthly to discuss each child's case and to check in regarding the collaboration process. CASAs will also be required to submit monthly logs that include all of their contacts for the children's cases, not just meet-

ings with the children's attorneys. CFCC staff will enter the logs into a database established specifically for the project.

For each case, the CASA and the attorney will be required to hold quarterly meetings to which they will invite other professionals involved in the case (social workers, mental health professionals, teachers, etc.). The meetings will focus on the services provided to the child, and the CASA will send reports of these meetings to the CFCC to further aid the study.

The project period will be three years, subject to the availability of state funds. Each county will monitor 10 infants and toddlers (3 years of age and under) and 25 teens (14 years of age and older). At its conclusion, CFCC staff will draft a final report to be distributed both statewide and nationwide that will detail promising practices and lessons learned.

● For more information, contact Stephanie Leonard, 415-865-7682; e-mail: [stephanie.leonard@jud.ca.gov](mailto:stephanie.leonard@jud.ca.gov). ■

## JAIC

*Continued from page 1*

## WORKSHOPS

The conference included five days of workshops and programs led by nationally recognized experts, trial court leaders, and staff from the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). All sessions were designed to provide relevant, day-to-day skills for implementing policies and operational procedures and for man-

aging change within the courts. Workshops included:

□ *Caseflow Management* A simulation of a real-life caseflow management process taught participants how to assess the effectiveness of their courts' systems. The workshop explained the importance of the fundamentals of caseflow management and how to develop and implement new systems.

□ *Conflict Management* Through the use of exercises, participants came to understand what roles they play in creating

or exacerbating conflict, how to practice the skills of conflict resolution, and ways that effective conflict managers think, act, and work together.

□ *Grant Development* This workshop introduced participants to the strategic process of grant development in the context of the local court. Participants practiced writing compelling problem/need statements and preparing and integrating budgets.

□ *Presentation Skills* Participants prepared and presented 10-minute presentations, received feedback from their colleagues and instructor, and returned to give their revised presentations.

Additional workshops addressed court security, project management, critical thinking skills, labor negotiations, business planning, data presentation and statistical analysis, strategic hiring, business writing, and integrating information systems. Many courses consisted of a full day of intensive, hands-on experience.

"All of us in the courts are tackling the same challenges—budget cuts, staff shortages, and mounting workloads," said Debbie Davis, Court Services Coordinator of the Superior Court of Contra Costa County. "It's been great to hear how others in the same position are addressing them."

## NEW CONFERENCE

The Judicial Administration Institute of California was formally created in 1994, with the mission of developing administra-

tive curricula for court leaders and staffs. Following JAIC's lead and building on some of its existing programs, the AOC's Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) is now responsible for developing judicial administrative curricula. This spring, following JAIC's own recommendation, the Governing Committee of CJER voted to transform JAIC into an annual conference for court managers and others with responsibility for local court operations.

CJER will publish materials from JAIC on its educational Web site at [www2.courtinfo.ca.gov/comet/](http://www2.courtinfo.ca.gov/comet/).

● For more information, contact Matthew Richter, JAIC program manager, 415-865-7748; e-mail: [matthew.richter@jud.ca.gov](mailto:matthew.richter@jud.ca.gov). ■



Participants in the conflict management workshop at the first annual Judicial Administration Institute of California conference shared their experiences and discussed ways to address disputes. Photo: Mark Pothier

## Court Welcomes Community



More than 60 people attended the Superior Court of Orange County's community conference held on September 13 at its Central Justice Center in Santa Ana. Conference participants shared their perceptions of changing community issues and needs that may influence the court's delivery of services and programs. Community leaders in attendance included representatives from the NAACP, Anti-Defamation League, Gay & Lesbian Community Services Center, Asian Pacific Islander Community Alliance, and Orange County Human Relations Commission. Photo: Courtesy of the Superior Court of Orange County



# The Changing Roles of SJOs

## A Conversation With Commissioner Patricia H. Wong



Commissioner  
Patricia H. Wong,  
Superior Court of  
Sacramento  
County

*In 1987, after nearly 10 years in private practice, then-attorney Patricia H. Wong decided to look into becoming a court commissioner in Sacramento County. She was curious about the position and thought it would be an interesting and positive career move. Fifteen years later, she leads the largest association of commissioners in the state.*

*In October, Commissioner Wong became the president of the California Court Commissioners Association and an advisory member of the Judicial Council. She had previously been a member of the council's Subordinate Judicial Officer Working Group, which recently issued its final report. The report clarifies and recommends duties that are appropriate for subordinate judicial officers (SJOs).*

*Court News spoke with Commissioner Wong about the report, the challenges facing SJOs, and her plans as president of the California Court Commissioners Association.*

### **What role do SJOs fill in the judicial process? How has that role changed?**

Traditionally SJOs have been used to preside over traffic and small claims matters. But over the years, in large part due to shortages of judges, there has been a demand to use SJOs more broadly. The roles of SJOs have evolved to include many family and juvenile law assignments. In fact, legislation was enacted to establish juvenile referees.

In addition, depending on the individual court's needs, many SJOs are essentially sitting as pro tem judges. Those SJOs are carrying out work traditionally done by judges, ranging from unlawful detainers and arraignments to jury trials and felony cases.

### **From a court administration perspective, what are the most pressing issues facing SJOs?**

The biggest administrative challenge is to use SJOs effectively to keep up with the daily workload. SJOs are the backbone of the court, often handling the high-volume assignments such as arraignments and court trials. Because of SJOs, courts are able to make more judges available for trials on a daily basis.

### **The Judicial Council's Subordinate Judicial Officer Working Group recently issued its report to the council. What does**

### **the report recommend, and what happens now?**

In its report, the working group essentially recommends that SJOs be rolled back to their traditional roles. For example, the report suggests that criminal trials and family and juvenile

courts should generally be overseen by judges, even though at present SJOs perform a significant portion of these workloads. SJOs would return to their original functions, such as traffic, small claims, and pretrial and uncontested civil matters.

The working group presented its report to the Judicial Council last August. At its August 30 meeting, the council directed Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) staff to prepare an implementation plan based on the recommendations made in the report. A major part of that plan is passing legislation that would authorize the conversion of SJO positions to judgeships.

### **What is the status of that legislation? What effect would it have on the judicial system?**

The legislation would authorize, through attrition, the conversion of vacant SJO positions to judgeships for courts where SJOs are performing assignments that should be handled by judges. The working group's recommendations would provide the basis for determining which duties

should be performed by which judicial officers.

Due to separation-of-powers issues, the Legislature holds the authority to designate the number of judges that should sit in each county. Therefore, the Legislature has indicated that additional work needs to be done to identify which positions in which courts should be converted so it has an accurate picture of how many SJOs are currently performing work that has been traditionally performed by judges.

A few years ago, the AOC conducted a preliminary survey of all the counties to determine the number of SJOs who were essentially sitting as judges pro tem and in what kinds of assignments. The study identified, by

county, how many SJOs were doing work that has now been defined as coming under a judge's responsibility. That information may provide a start, but the AOC and the courts will need to work together to update that information.

### **Currently, if SJOs sit postretirement, they are only compensated the difference between the hourly per diem rate and what they are receiving in retirement benefits.**

### **The California Court Commissioners Association hosted a roundtable discussion at the California Judges Association annual meeting in October. What were some of the issues that surfaced during the discussion?**

Several nuts-and-bolts issues affecting SJOs were brought up at that roundtable meeting.

One of the issues raised was the fact that many SJOs share concerns about their hybrid nature. We are judicial officers, subject to discipline from the Commission on Judicial Performance. But as a result of Senate Bill 2140, SJOs, like other court staff, are considered court employees. Thus, we do not share in the judges' retirement system and other benefits provided to judges by the state.

Many SJOs feel there should be some statewide consistency in their salaries and benefits. As an initial step, the AOC has agreed to conduct a survey of SJO salaries and employee benefits in all 58 counties.

### **What are your priorities as the new president of the California Court Commissioners Association?**

First, we will encourage the Judicial Council to introduce legislation that would convert vacant SJO positions to judge-

ships. In addition, we need to make sure that the legislation delineates conversion through attrition, so that no SJO will lose his or her job as a result. The legislation may eventually provide SJOs who have been thinking about applying for a judgeship with a great opportunity and motivation to do so.

Second, the association's board will be addressing post-retirement compensation for SJOs who wish to continue to assist the courts. Currently, if SJOs sit postretirement, they are only compensated the difference between the hourly per diem rate and what they are receiving in retirement benefits. Unlike retired judges who sit on assignment, SJOs are not entitled to the full per diem rate in addition to whatever they are receiving in retirement benefits.

Third, we will work with the AOC in identifying SJO salaries and employee benefits in all 58 counties and, perhaps, develop recommendations about what minimum salaries and benefits should be. ■

### **SJOs are the backbone of the court, often handling the high-volume assignments such as arraignments and court trials.**

## **SJO Report**

Among other recommendations, the Subordinate Judicial Officer Working Group's recent statewide report, *Subordinate Judicial Officers: Duties and Titles*, suggests that:

- Matters in criminal cases that can result in a custodial sentence be clearly distinguished from those that cannot, and that only the latter be delegated to SJOs;
- Adjudication of nearly all family and juvenile matters be considered a core judicial duty that should be performed by judges; and
- Adjudication of contested civil matters and civil matters involving serious, complex, and diverse factual and legal issues be performed by judges rather than SJOs.

● To view the full report, visit [www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/documents/sjowgfinal.pdf](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/documents/sjowgfinal.pdf).

# Third-Strike Sentencing of Crimes Without Minimum Terms

A number of appellate opinions have struggled with the relationship between the three-strikes law and crimes punished under the indeterminate sentencing law where there is no stated minimum term, particularly crimes punishable under the one-strike law (Pen. Code, § 667.61). The recent decision of the California Supreme Court in *People v. Acosta* (2002) 29 Cal.4th 105 appears to resolve most of the issues that have blurred the relationship between these two sentencing schemes.

Earlier the court had addressed circumstances under which a defendant is convicted of a crime without a stated minimum term and with one prior strike. *People v. Jefferson* (1999) 21 Cal.4th 86, in finding that a minimum period of parole eligibility is functionally equivalent to a stated minimum custody term, held that the trial court first must look to the statute defining the punishment for the crime. If the statute specifies a minimum period before the defendant is eligible for parole, the period is doubled. If the statute has no minimum period of parole but merely specifies that the term is “life,” the court should double the seven-year general minimum parole period specified in Penal Code section 3046.

Several appellate decisions, each with its own interpretation of the law, have addressed the circumstances under which a defendant is convicted of a crime without a stated minimum term and with two prior strikes: *People v. Ervin* (1996) 50 Cal.App.4th 259, *People v. Cornelius* (2000) 79 Cal.App.4th 771, *People v. Acosta* (2000) 80 Cal.App.4th

714, *People v. Graves* (2000) 80 Cal.App.4th 1336, *People v. Cervantes* (2002) 95 Cal.App.4th 1336, *People v. Johnson* (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 188, *People v. Snow* (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 239. The Supreme Court granted review of all cases except *Ervin* and *Johnson*; the court chose a consolidated appeal in *Acosta* and *Cornelius* as the vehicle to resolve the conflicting appellate authority.

*Acosta* addressed three issues. The court first determined that in the calculation of a third-strike sentence the trial court is to use the minimum parole period in the option 1 calculation of three times the term otherwise provided, without any enhancements. Second, the sentence calculation under option 3 is the minimum parole term, plus any applicable enhancements. Third, consistent with *Jefferson*, *Acosta* concluded that the trial court should first look to the specific penal statute for any prescribed minimum parole term, then to the general parole eligibility provisions of Penal Code section 3046.

If, for example, a defendant is convicted of rape with the infliction of torture, having suffered two prior residential burglary convictions, the calculation of the greatest minimum term under option 1 is 75 years (three times the 25-year parole period specified in Penal Code section 667.61(d)); under option 2 it is 25 years; under option 3 it is 25 years plus 10 years because of the prior serious felony convictions under section 667(a), for a total minimum custody period of 35 years. The greatest minimum term, therefore, is set by

option 1. The final effective sentence is 75 years to life, plus 10 years for the section 667(a) prior serious felony convictions.

Unless there are significant enhancements that will substantially raise the calculation under option 3, courts generally will select the calculation under option 1 as the greatest minimum term for those crimes that have designated minimum parole periods and will select option 2 when the parole period is specified by Penal Code section 3046. In either case, trial courts should add any applicable enhancements in the calculation of the final sentence.

*Acosta* next determined that the three-strikes and one-strike laws work in conjunction with each other. As explained by the court, “The term under the one-strike law is not imposed and then multiplied. Instead, the Three Strikes law itself imposes the indeterminate life term and requires reference to the one-strike law only in calculating the minimum term for that indeterminate sentence.” (*People v. Acosta, supra*, 29 Cal.4th at pp. 123–124.) In other words, if the defendant comes within the one-strike law and has suffered two or more prior strikes, the minimum parole periods specified in section 667.61 would be the basis of the calculation of the greatest minimum term in options 1 and 3, as discussed above.

The most controversial aspect of *Acosta* is that the court held that the *same* prior serious felony conviction (such as a lewd act under Penal Code section 288(a)) may be used first to qualify the defendant for the one-strike law, second as one of the strikes under the three-strikes

law, and third as a prior serious felony under section 667(a). The use of the same prior serious felony as a strike and under section 667(a) has long been settled. (See, for example, *People v. Ramirez* (1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 559.) Central to the discussion in *Acosta* was the application of Penal Code section 667.61(f), which provides: “If only the minimum number of [triggering] circumstances [under the one-strike law] have been pled and proved, . . . those circumstances shall be used as the basis for imposing the [one-strike law] rather than being used to impose the punishment authorized under any other law, unless another law provides for a greater penalty.”

The issue is best highlighted when the *sole* basis for imposing the one-strike or three-strikes law is a prior violent sexual assault conviction. The appellate court in *Acosta* found under such circumstances the prior sexual assault was “consumed” in the application of section 667.61(f); the defendant could be punished only under the one-strike law, not the three-strikes law. The majority of the Supreme Court disagreed for two reasons. First, since the three-strikes law imposes a “greater penalty,” the exception under section 667.61(f) applies. Second, the use of the prior conviction is different under the two statutes. The one-strike law simply is being used as the basis of the calculation of the minimum term of the third-strike sentence. The dissenting three justices, led by the Chief Justice, concluded that the Legislature intended that the prior sexual assault conviction could be used either under the three-strikes law or the one-strike law, but not *both*. ■



Judge J. Richard Couzens  
Superior Court of Placer County

*Judge Couzens is a former member of the Judicial Council and past chair of its Criminal Law Advisory Committee.*



## Courts Welcome New Fellows

In October, 10 new judicial fellows began assignments that promise to help them learn about and improve the administration of justice in California.

The Judicial Council of California and the Center for California Studies of California State University at Sacramento (CSUS) created the Judicial Administration Fellowship Program to develop professionals and leaders by educating them in the growing complexities of the court system. Fellows are assigned a variety of duties, depending on their office placement, interests, and skills. Each fellowship position combines a full-time professional field assignment in an office of the courts with graduate work in public policy administration at CSUS.

This year's participants will work from October 2002 through August 2003. Fellows are assigned as professional staff with the Supreme Court, the superior and appellate courts, and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). Following

is a brief introduction to the 2002–2003 Judicial Administration Fellows.

**Christina Andronache** received a B.A. in economics and international relations from Stanford University and is placed at the Superior Court of San Francisco County.

**Kimberley Gainey** received a B.A. in philosophy and psychology from California State University at Long Beach and is placed at the Superior Court of Sacramento County.

**Dominic Hwang** received a B.A. in English literature from the University of California at Irvine and is placed at the Superior Court of Yolo County.

**Adam Magid** received a B.A. in economics and political science from Stanford University and is placed at the Superior Court of Orange County.

**James Maynard** received a B.A. in history from the University of Cali-

fornia at Berkeley and is placed at the Superior Court of Alameda County, where he will work in the Planning, Research, Court Services, and Public Information Bureau.

**Megan Nelson** received a B.A. in government and economics from Claremont McKenna College and is placed at the Superior Court of Los Angeles County's Research Unit.

**Sylvia Papadakos-Morafka** received a B.A. in interdisciplinary studies from California State University at Dominguez Hills and a J.D. from Whittier Law School. She is placed at the Supreme Court's Office of the Clerk in San Francisco.

**Sewali Patel** received a B.A. in sociology from UC Berkeley and a J.D. from Vanderbilt Law School. She is placed at the AOC's Center for Families, Children & the Courts in San Francisco.

**Paula Sanchez** received a B.A. in international relations from Mills College and is placed at the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, in Los Angeles.

**Francis Shehadeh** received a B.A. in history from UC Berkeley and is placed at the AOC's Office of Governmental Affairs in Sacramento.



The 2002–2003 Judicial Administration Fellows are (clockwise from top left) Kimberley Gainey, Megan Nelson, Francis Shehadeh, James Maynard, Paula Sanchez, Sylvia Papadakos-Morafka, Adam Magid, Sewali Patel, Christina Andronache, and Dominic Hwang.